



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/644,086	08/20/2003	Ishay Rabinowitz	25646	4960

20529 7590 08/22/2007  
NATH & ASSOCIATES  
112 South West Street  
Alexandria, VA 22314

EXAMINER
----------

HWU, DAVIS D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3752

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

08/22/2007

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/644,086

Applicant(s)

RABINOWITZ, ISHAY

Examiner

Davis D. Hwu

Art Unit

3752

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 July 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17, 20 and 23-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 2, 4-17, 20 and 23-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 3 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 8/3/07.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

***Response to Amendment***

1. Applicant's amendment and arguments of July 12, 2007 have been entered.
2. Applicant's arguments have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.
3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. Claims 1, 2, 5, 8 and 24-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rinkewich.

Rinkewich discloses a pipe 2 connectable to a pressurized fluid source via a first end of the pipe, the pipe comprising a drip-irrigation plug emitter 10 whose circumferential extremity is in full contact with an inner circumference of the pipe, the emitter being mounted entirely within the pipe, the emitter having an inlet 14, a drip outlet as recited, and a flow-restricting path 28 therebetween, the emitter plugging the pipe with respect to any fluid flow except for the flow through the flow restricting path, wherein all fluid flowing through the pipe has to flow through the emitter. Regarding the extrusion and other processes recitations, whether a product is patentable depends on whether it is known in the art or it is obvious, and is not governed by whether the process by which it is made is patentable.

5. Claims 4, 6, 7, 10, 20, and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rinkewich in view of Karathanos.

Art Unit: 3752

Karathanos teaches a pipe 1 comprising a drip-irrigation plug emitter 2 mounted entirely within the pipe and forming a swelling at the outer surface of the pipe in which the emitter has a flow restricting path formed as a flow labyrinth. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that the device of Rinkewich could have a swelling at the outer surface of the pipe when the emitter is within the pipe as has been taught by Karathanos and it would also have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention to have modified the device of Rinkewich by making the flow restricting path to be a labyrinth as taught by Karathanos.

6. Claims 9 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rinkewich et al. in view of Hunter.

Hunter teaches a drip irrigation system comprising a filter 116 in the flow passageway to filter out particles and prevent clogging. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the device of Rinkewich et al. by incorporating a filter means upstream of the flow labyrinth as taught by Hunter to filter out particles before they enter and clog the labyrinth.

Regarding claim 11, it has been held that mere duplication of the essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art.

7. Claims 12-14 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rinkewich.

The method as recited would have been a matter of design choice depending on the required length of the pipe and irrigation coverage. Once those parameters have been

determined, the number of emitters can be inserted at the required intervals. Regarding claim 13, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to cut a long pipe into sections to form various lengths of pipe as required. An emitter can be placed at the end of each section as recited in claim 14.

8. Claims 15-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rinkewich in view of Christy.

Christy teaches an irrigation system comprising a pipe 11 having support stakes 16 to fix the pipe to the ground. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the device of Rinkewich et al. by providing a means for fixing the second of the pipe in a position relative to a plant as taught by Christy to prevent the pipe from inadvertent movement. Placing one end of the fixing means 16 into the pipe would have been a matter of design choice since it would still carry out the same function of fixing the pipe to the ground.

9. Claim 23 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rinkewich in view of Karathanos.

Rinkewich discloses the instant invention except for the swelling at the outer surface of the pipe. Karathanos teaches a pipe 1 comprising a drip-irrigation plug emitter 2 mounted entirely within the pipe and forming a swelling at the outer surface of the pipe in which the emitter has a flow restricting path formed as a flow labyrinth. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that the device of Rinkewich could have a swelling at the outer surface of the pipe when the emitter is within the pipe as has been taught by Karathanos and it would also have

been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention to have modified the device of Rinkewich by making the flow restricting path to be a labyrinth as taught by Karathanos.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

10. Claim 3 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

***Conclusion***


11. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Davis D. Hwu whose telephone number is 571-272-

Art Unit: 3752

4904. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-4:30. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kevin Shaver can be reached on 571-272-4720. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>.



Primary Examiner